

**REMARKS**

The Office Action in the above-identified application has been carefully considered and this amendment has been presented to place this application in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1–10 are in the present application. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Changes to the claims as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. sections 101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, and 8 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4, and 5 of co-pending U.S. Patent application 09/358,160. As noted by the Examiner, a timely filed terminal disclaimer may be used to overcome the provisional double patenting rejections provided the conflicting application for patent is shown to be commonly owned with the present application.

The conflicting application is commonly owned with the present application. However, it is not clear whether following prosecution the allowable claims from the present application will be obvious in view of the allowable claims in co-pending U.S. Patent application 09/358,160. Hence, Applicants agree to file a terminal disclaimer if the allowable claims in the application are found to be obvious at the time of issuance of U.S. Patent application 09/358,160.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Udagawa (U.S. Patent 6,519,000) in view of Hieda (U.S. Patent 6,011,583).

The present invention has a “scan converter means,” (shown as I/F Processing/Image Mix 3 in Figure 1) for converting progressive scan mode images into interlaced scan mode images, and vice versa. Specifically, the scan converter can convert: 1) interlaced images from the CCD to progressive images for storage in the PCMCIA card, 2) progressive images from the CCD to interlaced images for recording on the DV tape medium, and 3) progressive images from the PCMCIA card to interlaced images for recording on the DV tape medium. Note, progressive images may also be recorded onto the DV tape medium.

As noted by the Examiner, “Udagawa does not disclose scan converter means.” (Office Action page 4) The Examiner contends Hieda teaches a recording signal processing unit 4 for converting a progressive image signal into an interlaced image signal. (Figure 1; Column 4, Lines 58-65 and Column 7, Lines 39-43) However, Hieda’s recording signal processing unit 4 converts between a field mode, which is a normal interlaced signal, and a frame mode, which consists of every other frame of data output from the CCD. (Column 7, Lines 44-47) Hieda also discusses progressive scanning, which consists of every pixel of data output from the CCD at column 6, lines 45-48. Hence, Hieda’s frame mode (consisting of every other frame) is not equivalent to the progressive image signal (comprising every frame) recited in the present invention. Accordingly, Hieda fails to disclose scan converter means “for converting the image sensing signal in the interlace scan mode, into a progressive scan signal” as recited in the present claims. Furthermore, Hieda’s “recording signal processing unit 4 receives both of the signals SV1 and SV2,” wherein SV1 is the interlaced signal. SV1 must be combined with SV2 to produce the frame signal. In other words SV1, the interlaced signal, cannot by itself be

converted into the frame signal. Accordingly, Hieda does not disclose "converting the image sensing signal in the progressive scan mode, into an interlace scan signal" as required in the present invention.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Udagawa and Hieda fail to obviate the present invention and the rejected claims should now be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application as now presented is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

No additional fees are deemed to be required for the filing of this amendment, but if such are, the Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:



Darren M. Simon  
Reg. No. 47,946  
(212) 588-0800